

Analysis of Fallacies in Hillary and Trump's Second Presidential Debate

Asst. Prof. Sarab Khalil Hameed, Rusul Adnan Ne'ma Al-Asadi

Al-Mustansiriyah University, College of Arts, Baghdad, Iraq

Abstract— In every day conversations at home, school, bus...etc., people always utilize different strategies in language use in order to achieve their aims to get what they want, one of these strategies is making fallacies. Fallacies can be defined as a deceptive tactic that the arguer may employ to convince the listener by violating one of the ten rules of reasonableness. Those fallacies are usually exploited via the candidates in the presidential debates in order to beat the other party and persuade their onlookers to win the electoral race.

Therefore, the current study aims at identifying the effect of fallacies and their role as a maneuver tools in political text, it detects the ten rules of reasonableness and the methods by which the discussants may violate them to commit a fallacy. Likewise the study tends to show the various types of fallacies and which fallacy score the higher frequency. The study hypothesized that violating rule 4 is the most prominent fallacy committed in the debates under investigation. The data includes the second US presidential debate that set between Clinton and Trump in 2016. It is analyzed based on Emeren's et al. (2002) concept of fallacies.

The main results obtained from the analysis verified the hypothesis and concluded that committing fallacies is widely used by arguers in presidential debates, the debaters violate all rules and the violation of rule 4 is the most prominent one. Besides, rule 9 can be described as the general characteristics of the debate since all the debate is about violating it.

Keywords— *Fallacies, rules, reasonableness, violation, presidential debate, arguers.*

I. INTRODUCTION

According to Emeren (2010:1), the basic aim of any argumentation is to resolve the difference of opinion on the acceptability of the standpoint by appealing to the other party's reasonableness. Even in political debates when the aim of the arguing is not to convince each other but to win over the audiences, the interlocutors still argue with each other as if they are going to resolve the different view

between them in order to appear reasonable to the viewers, i.e., to give impression of being reasonable but most of times they make fallacies in order to persuade the audiences and win the debate. Then, the reason behind utilizing fallacies is to persuade the audience to get their votes rather than to find the truth.

According to Freely and Steinberg (2009: 20), presidential debate is that type of discussion which is designed under special set of rules and for special occasion. It can be considered as a formal event in which the discussants use their power of speech to show that their plan is designed for the benefit of the audience while the opponent plan is not in order to get the listeners' votes. (Bahm et al., 2004:14).

Moreover, Kaid and Bacha (2008:41) assert that debate has a distinct outcome represented by the picture of the arguer in the eyes of critics or audiences. Within debate, one can find a true battle or even a boxing ring where the aim of the debaters is to knock out each other which is more important for them rather than focusing on logical argumentation. So, it is "face to face battles includes two political candidates fight through a dialog". (Vion, 1992: 92, Arroyo, 2003: 397).

The nature of political debate makes it a suitable environment to study and detect fallacies, to discover how fallacies can be worked and exploited to achieve the persuading aims as it will be revealed in the next sections.

II. FALLACIES

Emeren and Grootendorst (1992:208-9) have suggested ten rules of reasonableness. The arguers need to know about these rules and if they follow them, it is said to be reasonable since they want to resolve the differences between them in a reasonable way but if not, they will make argumentation moves that violate one or more rules which threaten the resolution of the standpoint in order to persuade the viewers and turn the burden of proof to one side rather than another. Fallacies is a "*pauz pas of communication*". They can be considered as wrong moves in argumentative

discourse in the sense of violation of the reasonable critical discussion rules. So, fallacies are the violation of the reasonable rules (Eemeren, 2010: 193-4, Eemeren and Grootendorst, 2004:187-90 and Walton, 1995:41).

Then, fallacies can be defined as:

"Every violation of any of the rules of the discussion procedure for conducting a critical discussion (by whichever party at whatever stage in the discussion) is a fallacy" (Eemeren and Grootendorst's, 2004: 175).

".....a violation of one or more of the rules for a critical discussion, which impedes the resolution of a difference of opinion" (Eemeren et al., 2009:20)

However, the ten rules of reasonableness in any critical discussion can be described as follow:

2.1 Rule 1: The Freedom Rule

Parties must not prevent each other from advancing standpoints or casting doubt on standpoint

This commandment is prepared to make sure that the discussants can put forward a standpoint and doubt regarding it freely. So the parties in any discussion need to give each other unlimited place and freedom in order to introduce and /or criticize a standpoint and argument, i.e. calling them into question. This means that each party must get his opportunity to occupy his position in the discussion. (Eemeren et al., 2002: 110) (Eemeren et al., 2009:21).

According to Eemeren et al. (2002:110), this rule can be violated by two ploys:

1. **Placing limits on the standpoints or doubts** that may be expressed and in its turn this can be performed in two methods:
 - A. **Declaring certain standpoint sacrosanct, or not open to question** as in the following example (ibid.):

(1.1) "I'm going to buy a new car. We can discuss its color and type or anything you want, but not whether it will be bought or not."
 - B. **Declaring certain standpoint taboos** as in (ibid.):

(1.2) "I don't think that it is good to say that your grandfather was a thief. One must not speak badly about the dead."

2. **Restricting a parties freedom of action**, according to Eemeren et al. (2002:111) It is a real attempt to drive out the party as a serious one in the discussion. This violation

has two variants and each one has its own strategies as follow:

A. **Put the discussant under pressure** in order not to introduce a standpoint or objection regarding his opponent view. This can be achieved by:

I. Physical force, which is not at stake in the current study.

II. Fallacy of the stick, where parties threat each other by violence or else types of sanctions either directly as (*If you try to get the city council to approve that, I will send my thugs after you*) or in a more subtle way, i.e., indirectly as (*Of course you must make your own decision, but remember that we're one of your top clients*) (ibid.).

III. Appeal to pity, Eemeren et al. (ibid.) notify that the best way of making pressure on the discussant is by playing on his emotions (emotional blackmail) as in "*How can you have given me a failing mark for my thesis? I've worked on it night and day*".

B. **Discredit the party in the eyes of the audiences** in order to make him undeserved for credibility. Then his argument will fall into no defense This means that the arguer will attack the other party's personality and this has three variants: (ibid.)

I. Abusive variant (direct personal attack), by deceptive the other party as stupid, evil, unreliable and so on (ibid.:112).

II. Circumstantial variant (indirect personal attack), in which the arguer casting suspicion on the other party's motives for instance by making him as one who biased to one side rather than another (ibid.).

III. tu quoque variant (you also variant), a fallacy of a pointing out a contradiction in the other arguer's words or deeds such as that he has a contradiction in his opinion in the past and present (ibid.).

2.2 Rule 2: The Burden of Proof Rule

A party that advances a standpoint is obliged to defend it if the other party asks him to do so.

According to Eemeren et al. (2002:113) and Eemeren and Grootendorst (2004:191), this commandment insure that a standpoint which is introduced and called into question in any dispute (argumentative discourse) is defended against any critical attack. This means the person who introduces a standpoint must be always ready to defend it. Two tricks are used to violate this rule:

1. *shifting the burden of proof* in which the arguer is escaping from the obligation to defend a standpoint by turning the burden of proof to the person who is criticizing the standpoint "you first improve that it is not so" i.e., prove that it is wrong. This shifting is injustice because a party who criticize a standpoint cannot be saddled with the job of the opposite party even if he doesn't introduce any standpoint (ibid.:114).

2. *Evading the burden of proof*, in this way the party may introduce the standpoint as one that needs no proof at all. There are three ploys by which one can achieve this evading (ibid.:116)

A. Presenting the standpoint as evidence such as in the expressions "It is obvious that...", "Nobody in their right mind would deny that...", "It goes without saying that...". Such expressions make the antagonist feel depressed and cannot voice his doubts (ibid.).

B. Introducing personal guarantee for the correction of the standpoint as in: "I can assure you that...", "There is no doubt in my mind that...", "I am absolutely convinced that...", "You cantake it from me that...". And so on.

C. Shaping the standpoint in a manner which makes it safe from any criticism due to the fact that it cannot be evaluated or tested. Examples of such violation "Men are *by nature* hunters". If one tries to reject the standpoint that men are by nature "hunters" by mentioning one or more of those who are not hunters, the opponent will claim that those men i.e., counterexamples are irrelevant since they do not behave according to their nature Eemeren et al. (2002:116).

2.3 Rule 3: the Standpoint Rule

A party's attack on a standpoint must relate to the standpoint that has indeed been advanced by the other party.

This rule includes that the defense and the attack in the dispute must be related to the genuine standpoint that introduced by the protagonist. Then, this rule can be violated when the antagonist criticizes unrelated standpoint and the protagonist in his turn will defend also a different stand point. As a result the original standpoint will be distorted and there will be a multiple differences of opinion (Eemeren's et al. 2002: 116, Eemeren's et al. 2009:22).

Eemeren et al. (2002: 117) state that there are two ploys of violating this rule. They are achieved when a party

commits a fallacy of the *straw man*, i.e., the attributed standpoint can be attacked more easily by building a straw man who can knock down with the most simplest ways.

1. *Misrepresenting the genuine standpoint*, this can be achieved when the standpoint is presented in a manner that makes it more difficult to be defended or untenable or even trivial when the arguer takes it out of context by either exaggerating or oversimplifying it (Eemeren et al. 2002: 117).

As for exaggerating, the arguer will replace quantifiers as "some" or "few" with "all"; then his standpoint will become untenable (ibid.). On the other hand, oversimplification involves leaving out the restrictions and nuances such as when one accusing someone of having written that homeopaths are charlatans, whereas what the person had actually written was that homeopaths are a group in which "the line between legitimate and charlatan is very fuzzy" (ibid.).

2. The second ploy includes *attributing a fictitious standpoint to the opponent* by:

A. Emphatically putting forward the opposite standpoint. For instance if someone ensures that "I personally believe that the defense of our democracy is of great importance", he implicitly refers that the antagonist thinks otherwise, i.e., oppositely. If the antagonist does not save himself by saying that he is also a great hero of democracy, he will rise the doubt that he does not support democracy (ibid.).

B. Referring to a group which the antagonist belongs to and connect this group with the fictitious standpoint. For instance:

(1.3) "He says that he thinks this hospital is useful, but as a doctor he naturally sees it as unhealthy."

In the above example, the party explains what doctors think about the issue and what applies to the group must apply to all its members (ibid.).

C. The third way includes using expressions such as "Nearly everyone thinks that...", "Educators are of the opinion that...", and "Everyone has been saying lately that..." . Such expressions do not advance the person who really holds the standpoints under attack since there is no surveys, opening polls or any other document evidence which show that there are really people who assert those standpoint. This ploy includes not only a fictitious standpoint but also a fictitious opponents (ibid.:118).

2.4 Rule 4: The Relevance Rule

Standpoints may not be defended by non-argumentation or argumentation that is not relevant to the standpoint.

According to Eemerene et al. (2002: 119), rule 4 insures that two conditions must be occurred in the defense of any standpoint: the defense can take place only by means of argument and those arguments must be relevant to the standpoint at issue. Two variants are suggested to violate this rule:

1. **The fallacy of irrelevant argumentation** in which the arguments have no relation to original standpoint, i.e., the arguer defends standpoint which is not the one at issue that fired the difference of opinion. However, within this point a necessary question can be appeared which is "What is the different between the current fallacy and the straw man one?" since both of them deal with standpoint other than the genuine one. In the irrelevant argumentation it is the protagonist who manipulates his standpoint in order to make it easier to defend rather than to attack as in the straw man in which the antagonist job is to distort the standpoint.

2. **The fallacy of non-argumentation** in which the arguer acts as he defends his standpoint by means of argumentation but the fact is that he uses means other than argumentation such as rhetorical devices those which include the classical appeals of persuasion: *Ethos* and *Pathos* (ibid.).

However, when the discussant manipulated by the emotions of the audiences he will commit a *pathetic fallacy* which has two facets: positive such as the appealing to the security or loyalty feelings and negative such as appealing to the negative emotions of fear, shame, greed... etc.(ibid.)

On the other hand the speaker who uses *ethos* will commit an *ethical fallacy of abuse authority*. The aim of the arguer who uses *ethos* depending on his expertise or good qualities is to make the audiences have faith in his credibility, integrity so, they easily will accept his standpoint. *Ethos* may be employed in the situations that appealed to expert's opinion in which the protagonist is the only witness to a special subject as in the situation that needs a specialized knowledge to be judged that cannot be existed in the normal people. then *ethos* can be used badly to make a fallacy(Eemerene et al., 2002: 121)

2.5 Rule5: Unexpressed Premise Rule

Discussants may not falsely attribute unexpressed premises to the other party, nor deny responsibility for their own unexpressed premises

This rule is connected with the fact that every day conversations include a lot of unexpressed premises that

communicate various meanings indirectly .The same case is in the critical discussion in which the protagonist argumentation includes parts that have been remained implicit in the discourse.(Eemerene et al.,2002 :121-122) (Eemerene and Grootendorst, 2004:192)

Eemerene et al.(2002:122), highlight that this rule can be violated by two ways from both the antagonist and the protagonist. As regarding to the *the antagonist*, he may take advantage of the implicitness of the unexpressed premises and misrepresents them by exaggerating their scope and adds other unexpressed premises which go further from what are actually warranted, i.e., beyond the commitment created by the protagonist's defense. As a result , the standpoint will be attack in an easy way. This type of fallacy is called ***magnifying what has been left unexpressed.***

On the other hand, with reference to *theprotagonist*, he commits the *fallacy of denying an unexpressed premise* when he refuses to handle a responsibility for what it is implied in his own defense by hiding behind an expression such as "*I never said that*". This fallacy achieved by the protagonist as a reaction to the antagonist's behaviour when he makes what is implied in the former's argumentation explicit to the audience (ibid.).

2.6 Rule6: The Starting Point Rule

A party may not falsely present a premise as an accepted starting point nor deny a premise representing an accepted starting point

Eemerene et al. (2009: 23) remark that this rule includes that the starting point of any discussion must be used in an appropriate way when the standpoint of that discussion is being attacked and defended. Both the protagonist and the antagonist need to know their common starting point before they go ahead in the discussion in order for the differences of opinion to be resolved.

Eemerene et al. (2002:129) notify that this rule can be violated by both the protagonist and antagonist interchangeably. ***The antagonist*** violates it when he inquires already accepted proposition as a common starting point or a proposition that a protagonist may correctly suppose that the antagonist is to be committed to it, depending on verifiable information as when suddenly in the middle of a discussion and for opportunistic reasons the antagonist asking about previously arranged preposition .For instance "*But what is wrong with incest anyway?*", where the word wrong is early agreed about in the starting point.

In his turn, as Eemerene et al. (ibid.) point out that the **protagonist** violates this rule by acting that a specific premise is an agreed starting point while it is not. It is a kind of trick is to introduce such controversial thing (statement) in order to prevent the starting point at issue from being attacked. This can be achieved by the employment of the following methods:

1. **Unfair use of presupposition**, the protagonist introduces a statement as a presupposition of another statement as in "*I can't understand why John doesn't do something about that gambling addiction*". The presupposition here is that (John is addicted to gambling). So he falsely presents that addiction is a confirmed reality.

Another deceptive way of using presupposition can be achieved via utilizing *the fallacy of many questions* as in "*Who have you quarreled with today?*" Such example implies two tacit questions (Have you quarreled with anyone today?) and (Who have you quarreled with?). Then the impression that there is a common starting point which is "there has been a quarrel" is created (ibid.).

2. **Fallacy of circular reasoning** in which the protagonist may make *a fallacy of use an argument which is a synonymous with the standpoint at issue* in order to defend it in spite of their very knowledge that this argument cannot belong to the starting point as in:

(1.4) "*Racial discrimination is a punishable offense because it's against the law.*"

The circularity here cannot be obvious from the first glance since the argument and the standpoint are almost identical unless one realizes that "a punishable offense" includes violating the law (ibid.:129-130).

2.7 Rule7: The Argument Scheme Rule

A party may not regard a standpoint as conclusively defended if the defense does not take place by means of an appropriate argumentation scheme that is correctly applied.

Eemerene et al. (2002: 130) point out that this commandment is designed to ensure that the protagonists adopt an appropriate argument scheme and apply this scheme correctly for the defense purposes. So, this rule can be violated when the discussant uses an improper argument scheme or applies it in an incorrect way by using different ploys. By following this trick, the discussant may commit the following types of fallacies:

1. **populist fallacy**, which is the result of inappropriately applying the argument from popular opinion. The argument in which the view of some number of people is introduced

based on a symptomatic relation. The basic idea here is that accepted a standpoint advanced is a must because so many people agree with it. The following comment illustrates that this is not correct: (Eemerene et al., 2002: 131)

(1.5) "*Hundreds of thousands of cheering readers, viewers, or listeners are no proof at all of the correctness of an idea, and it is pure demagoguery to use their opinion as an argument.*"

2. **Fallacy of inappropriately appealed to causal relation** in which one may use causal argument scheme incorrectly. It includes three variations:

A. **The fallacy of confusing facts with value judgments**, it is the argument from consequences. This fallacy can be worked as "*It isn't true, because I don't want it to be true*" or "*It's true, because I want it to be true*". An example of such fallacy can be as (ibid.):

(1.6) "*It can't be raining, because that would mean we'd have to cancel our picnic.*"

B. **The fallacy of post hoc ergo propter hoc**, ("after this, therefore, because of this") in which the cause and effect relation based on a fact that the one thing preceded the other as stated by Eemerene et al. (ibid.: 132) in the following example when this fallacy is committed by the coach when he suggests that the higher average of ticket sales due to his taking on the job:

(1.7) "*I like the Milan team. I like the way they play, their courage, their drive to win. Since I came we have gone from 40 to 71 thousand season ticket holders. There must be a reason for this.*"

C. **The fallacy of slippery slope**, in which the arguer wrongly judges that by making certain actions, things will be turning from bad to worse, i.e., bad events will happen if certain positions are held in spite of there is no one evidence that actions such as negative effects will be occurred. This type can be detected in Gerrit Komrij's speech about the consequences of government support of activities that are being designed to protect women (but not homosexuals) from sexual violence (Eemerene et al., 2002: 132.):

(1.8) "*Those who find sexual violence important only when it is aimed at a limited and arbitrary group like girls and women will end up, if their reasoning is carried to its logical conclusion, finding any form of violence acceptable as long as it is aimed at an enemy specially marked out for that purpose.*"

3. **Fallacy of abuse authority** in which a proposition is introduced as an accepted one based on the opinion of persons or written sources which are presented inappropriately as that one which owns an authority. Since

they say it is so, then their view must be accepted (ibid.:131).

4. **Fallacy of hasty generalization** in which the fallacy is generalized based on the evidence of very few observations as in:

(1.9) "After having spent our 2001 vacation in *The Maldives*, we went there again in 2002, which shows that it's a great place for tourists."

There is no proof can be taken from one tourist couple who has visited *The Maldives* twice that is a great place for all tourists in general (ibid.).

5. **Fallacy of false analogy** in which when two or more compared things are not actually comparable besides there is some special circumstances those which invalidate the comparison (ibid.). This type can be more clarified in the following example as it is cited in Walton (1995:60-1):

(1.10) "Suppose someone defended open textbook examinations with the following argument: "No one objects to the practice of a physician looking up a difficult case in medical books. Why, then, shouldn't students taking a difficult examination be permitted to use their textbook?"

In this example the fallacy of fault analogy can be observed from the little similarity between the two situations in spite of the act of looking inside books since the two cases are different in context of the action and the purpose of each one (ibid.).

2.8 Rule 8: The Validity Rule

The reasoning in the argumentation must be logically valid or capable of being validated by making explicit one or more unexpressed premises

In order to resolve a difference of opinion, the protagonist needs to use reasoning which must be valid in the logical sense. Two ways are followed to violate this rule (Eemeren et al., 2002:132):

1. **Faulty reasoning** in which the reasoning is still invalid in spite of making everything explicit after being unexpressed. They (ibid.: 133) state that this fallacy has many forms but the best two well-known forms are resulted from affirming the consequent and denying the antecedent via treating a sufficient conditions as a necessary ones:

An example of such fallacy can be as :

(1.11) "If you eat spoiled fish (antecedent) you get sick. (consequent)

Ann is sick (Affirmation of the consequent)."

Therefore, *Ann has eaten spoiled fish.*

"If you eat spoiled fish (antecedent) you get sick. (consequent)."

"Ann hasn't eaten spoiled fish (Denial of the antecedent)."

Therefore, *Ann is not sick*

In the above examples, reasoning is invalid since there might be other reasons than eating spoiled fish can make Anna get sick (ibid.).

2. **Fallacy of division** in which the arguer incorrectly attributes a property of the whole to the component parts or vice versa (*the fallacy of composition*). This play may "treat the whole as a simple sum of the separate parts or assume that every property of the whole can also be applied to each one of the component parts". Anywise, the reality is in contrast since what is true for the parties is not a must to be true for the whole. For instance if a soup is made from components each one is a delicious by itself does not mean that the soup must be a delicious (ibid.) :

2.9 Rule 9: The Closure Rule

A failed defense of a standpoint must result in the party that put forward the standpoint retracting it and a conclusive defense in the other party retracting his doubt about the standpoint.

According to Eemeren et al. (2002:134), rule 9 includes that both discussants, the protagonist and the antagonist, must agree on the outcomes of the discussion. Otherwise the difference of opinion will stick at the same point. This means that both of them need to accept the consequences. So, this commandment has to do with the consequences of the argumentation.

On one hand, according to Eemeren et al. (2002:135) if the protagonist does not defend his standpoint and convince the antagonist, then he must give up his view or he will commit *the fallacy of refusing to retract a standpoint that has not been defended successfully*. But if he succeeded, the antagonist, by his turn, must turn back his criticism of that standpoint since he has failed to criticize the opponent's view. *Otherwise the fallacy of refusing to retract criticism of a standpoint that has been defended successfully* is to be committed.

According to Eemeren et al. (2001:136) another violation of this rule can be achieved by attributing inflated consequences to the successful defense or attack. *Firstly*, protagonist who is successfully defended his standpoint must anticipate that the opponent will move back his doubts about the standpoint and nothing more than this because his success does not entail the truthfulness of that very standpoint. Otherwise, he will make *a fallacy of concluding that a standpoint is true because it has been defended*

successfully. Secondly, likewise, the antagonist must not make a claim that the failure of a defense means that the standpoint is false and the opposite is true (if the protagonist fails in his defense, this does not mean that he must accept the opposite one) or he will make the fallacy of concluding that a standpoint is true since the opposite one has not been successfully defended.

2.10 Rule 10: The Usage Rule

A party must not use formulations that are insufficiently clear or confusingly ambiguous and he must interpret the other party's formulations as carefully and accurately as possible (i.e., not to misinterpret the opponent's formulation)

The language of the arguer in any discussion must be clear and unambiguous in order for the difference of opinion to be resolved. This difference can be solved only if each party takes notes (i.e., makes a real effort) to express his view in such a way that minimize the opportunities of misunderstanding besides not to misunderstand the opponent's speech acts. Then rule ten is violated by whatever party when he uses unclear or ambiguous language to turn the discussion to his own favor. As a result, it is said that he commits the fallacy of unclarity or the fallacy of ambiguity (Eemeren et al., 2002:136).

1. The fallacy of unclarity:

According to Eemeren et al. (2002:137) The fallacy of unclarity includes the structural unclarity at the textual level which is resulted from the illogical order, lack of coherence, obscure structure...etc. and the unclarity at the sentence level, that can be represented by:

1. implicitness
2. indefiniteness
3. unfamiliarity
4. vagueness

They can be illustrated more within an example in which someone says: *John is kleptomaniac*. Here many questions may be asked from the listener for clarification purposes such as:

1. Are you warning me or just informing me?
2. Charles? Charles who?
3. A kleptomaniac? What's that?
4. What do you mean, he's a kleptomaniac? Do you mean once upon a time he stole something, or do you mean he makes a habit of stealing things?

However, Eemeren et al. (ibid.) highlight that each one of these four questions deals with one of the factors of unclarity at the sentence level as follow:

Question one "the implicitness", the context can be handled more than one interpretation so the listener is confused

about the illocutionary force (i.e., the communicative function of the speech act).

Question two, "the indefiniteness", the reference here is indefinite, i.e., unclear. So the listener searches about the clarification for the propositional content (ibid.).

Question three, "the unfamiliarity", it also refers to the unclarity in the propositional content but this time the predication is doubtful since the listener here may not understand what the speaker means because the word kleptomaniac is unfamiliar word for him and he does not know its meaning and to what thing it may indicate (ibid.:38).

Question four, "vagueness", here the listener does not know what the speaker exactly means by *kleptomaniac*. Although he knows the meaning of the word. So, he asks about the criteria which are vague: How often must someone steal to be listed as one who has kleptomaniac (Eemeren et al., 2002:138).

2. The fallacy of ambiguity

As regarding the fallacy of ambiguity it has to do with situations in which the words and phrases have more than one meaning and this can be achieved with three reflections: statements, questions and references as follow (ibid.):

A. Ambiguous Statements as in "That is Anna's portrait" which can be interpreted in three different ways:

1. The portrait was painted by Anna.
2. The portrait is owned by Anna.
3. Anna is the subject of the portrait.

B. Ambiguous Questions as in "Who is Anna?" which in its turn can be interpreted at least into four ways:

1. Which of you three is Anna?
2. Who in this picture is Anna?
3. Who is the actor that plays Anna?
4. What can you tell me about Anna?

C. Ambiguity of Reference, for instance "Anna gave Mary the mail; it was her last day here". The reference here is ambiguous since it has been lost between Sara and Carla and one does not know to which girl the reference "her" is referred to (ibid.).

III. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Data Collection

The data of the current work is represented by the second American presidential debate that held between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump in October 9. The data is selected purposefully, according to Creswell (2011:206) "purposeful sampling is the process of selecting people or sites who can best help us understand our phenomenon". Then, the presidential debate data is chosen specifically.

The topics discussed in the debate go around social, economic and political issues.

The debate in its visual and written form has been downloaded from the website:

<http://fortune.com/2016/10/09/presidential-debate-read-transcript-donald-trump-hillary-clinton/>

3.2 Methods of Analysis

1. The data collected will be analyzed based on Eemeren's et al. concept of fallacies (2002) to discover how the debaters will commit a fallacy via violating the ten rules of reasonableness that can be violated by the discussants in any argumentation.

2. Since analyzing the whole data will occupy a large space and in order to avoid redundancy, the researcher will mention **only some examples** to be analyzed.

3. The results will be set through numbers in tables to show the validity of the research and to reject or verify the hypothesis of the study. Then, discussion and conclusions have been drawn Based on the results of the analysis.

IV. THE ANALYSIS

4.1 Analyzing Fallacies

-Rule1:

- Clinton violates this rule by putting Trump under pressure when she appeals to pity by her arguments *"Obviously, I'm hoping to earn your vote, I'm hoping to be elected in November, and I can promise you, I will work with every American."* She practices the emotional blackmail to confuse Trump and gains the audience's votes.

- Another fallacy can be committed within this rule is achieved when Clinton places limits on her standpoint as she introduces some sacrosanct things that must not be criticized since they are very important values to her *"... we are great because we are good, and we will respect one another, and we will work with one another, and we will celebrate our diversity. These are very important values to me"*. Trump violates this rule in a similar way when he says: *"I am a person who has great respect for people, for my family, for the people of this country"*. He ensures that respecting his family, American people and his country is one of great importance for him.

- Another violation is that when Trump restricts the freedom of Clinton's action when he threatens her directly: *"But if I win, I am going to instruct my attorney general to get a special prosecutor to look into your situation, because there has never been so many lies"*. By doing so, he puts her under pressure then, she will be confused to defend her standpoint.

-Rule2:

- The violation of this rule is committed through evading the burden of proof by making a personal guarantee for the correction of the statement *"... and I can promise you, I will work with every American."* Clinton gives American people a promise (personal guarantee) that she will work with everyone to make America strong again. Trump also presents his personal guarantee for the correction of the standpoint as in his argument *"And I will tell you, I will take care of ISIS"*. He promises them that he will destroy ISIS.

- Clinton violates this rule by shifting the burden of proof to her opponents *"everything you've heard just now from Donald is not true. I'm sorry I have to keep saying this, but he lives in an alternative reality"*. Instead of defending her standpoint, she accuses Trump that what he is saying is not true. Then, he needs to improve to the audience his truthfulness.

- Shaping the standpoint as a one that cannot be criticized is the method in which Clinton breaks this rule as she says *"And we've had many successful Muslims. We just lost a particular well-known one with Muhammad Ali"*. Here, her standpoint can not be evaluated since it is uncontroversial to all Americans that Mohammed Ali is a successful Muslim.

-Rule3:

- Trump violates this rule by putting a standpoint and implicitly refers that his antagonist has the opposite standpoint (the bad situation) as in his words *"So don't tell me about words. I am absolutely I apologize for those words. But it is things that people say. But what President Clinton did,..."*. He indicates that he apologizes for his words in contrast with his opponent's husband Bill Clinton.

- To violate this rule, Clinton attributes a fictional opponent to the situation represented by *"like everyone else, I've spent a lot of time thinking..."*. Is everybody else thinking just like her? and if they are, who are they? Those opponents are from her imagination to support her position in the debate and make it stronger than her antagonist.

- Another violation within this point is triggered by exaggerating the standpoint under attack to push the opponent into a difficult situation in which he cannot defend his standpoint as when Trump magnifies the bad effects of Obama Care by using the quantifier "all" instead of "few, some, etc., as in his argument *"Obamacare is a disaster. You know it. We all know it"*

-Rule4:

- The violation of this rule is achieved via asserting irrelevant argumentation as when Trump attacks a

standpoint other than the genuine one instead of answering the viewer question and defending his own standpoint and this is obvious in his arguments *"Obamacare is a disaster. You know it. We all know it. It's going up at numbers that nobody's ever seen worldwide. Nobody's ever seen numbers like this for health care.."* He attacks Obama Care instead of showing his plans to repair it.:

-The second way by which the debaters violate rule 4 is that of using the rhetorical devices *"pathos and ethos"*. These two moods are widely employed in the second debate, examples of such usage can be presenting as follow:

- **Pathos:** Clinton exploits pathos to evoke the audience's emotions via employing words that reflect positive emotion of loyalty and sympathy such as "our country, our children and our grandchildren" in *"I want us to heal our country and bring it together because that's, I think, the best way for us to get the future that our children and our grandchildren deserve."*

Pathos: The employment of pathos also triggered by asserting words full of scare and worry emotions such as *"horrible and a terrorist state"* in order to persuade the audience that the strategies of the current government has bad and dangerous effects as when Trump says *"watch what's happening with some horrible things like Obamacare.....when I look at the Iran deal where we're giving back \$150 billion to a terrorist state"*.

-**Ethos:** Clinton utilizes ethos to direct the light to her own figure via introducing her good intention as that person who wants to work on the behalves of all American people as in *"I want a country where citizens like you and your family are just as welcome as anyone else" and "*By this way she tries to build a bridge with her audience to convince them by her personality and turn the table into her side. **Trump** also shaping his character in a favorable way when he portrays himself as that one who shows solidarity and good projects to make America better *"We're going to make great deals. We're going to have a strong border. We're going to bring back law and order"*, *"And my whole concept is to make America great again".and "we are going to bring back law and order"*.

-**Ethos:** Clinton presents Trump as a dishonest man when she is saying that he is unfit besides he insulted women *"that he was not fit to be president" and "we have seen him insults women"*. In his turn, **Trump** uses ethos to improve Clinton's incredibility and untrustworthiness via calling her indirectly a liar and deceitful: *"...I am going to instruct my attorney general*

*to get a special prosecutor to look into your situation, because there has never been so many lies, so much deception".*As a result her standpoints will not be taking into grants and her veracity will be in doubt position.

- Rule5:

-Denying the unexpressed premise is the fallacy which results from violating rule 5 when Trump rejects what it is implied in his own argument. This refusing triggered by the expression *"No, I didn't say that at all. I don't think you understood what was...."*

-To break this rule, Clinton also denies what is implied in her argument. She does not presents any defense for his standpoint ,and her role is limited to say "that is not true" as when she asserts that *"every-thing you've heard just now from Donald is not true. I'm sorry I have to keep saying this, but he lives in an alternative reality."*She called trump indirectly as a liar and madman instead of improve that his argument is false.

-Rule6:

-Violating this rule is triggered by employing the unfair use of presupposition by introducing a statement as a presupposition of another statement that belongs to the standpoint under discussion *"I was so tired of seeing such foolish things happen to our country"* .Using **"such foolish things"** postulated that there are many foolish stuffs that already happened in America even if the arguer does not mention any of such things.

-Another violation is presented via the use of many questions strategy to presuppose implicitly a statement as part of the agreed starting point *"You say who's making these deals?"*. This question implies the presupposition that there are many deals talked about before.

-Moreover Clinton presents the proposition *"...We are not at war with Islam. And it is a mistake and it plays into the hands of the terrorists to act as though we are..."* as part of the already agreed standpoint. This presupposes that Trump tends to make a war with Muslims because of his behaviors against them. She tends to unfair use of presupposition to distract the audience from the original standpoint.

-Rule7:

-Erroneously stating that what is happening in Canada will be happened in America is the way in which this rule can be violated to commit a fallacy via Trump.By doing so Trump commits the fallacy of fault analogy and this clear in his argument *"which would be a disaster, somewhat similar to Canada."* There is no evidence that what occurred with Canadian people will happen with

Americans besides it is not fair since the system of Obama care is still does not repair so how he can judge on something does not achieve yet?

-The violation of this rule is marked also by saying the following sentence *"If we set those goals and we go together to try to achieve them, there's nothing in my opinion that America can't do"*. Here the arguer commits the fallacy of confusing facts, "It is true because I do want it to be true".

-Clinton also performs the **fallacy of false authority** that count within the violation of rule7 by stating that *"he was not fit to be president and commander-in-chief. And many Republicans and independents have said the same thing"*. She employs them erroneously as in apposition to know ,so, their opinion must be taking into account. The fact is that they are not in a position of authority to said so. It is quite possible for them to be lairs and she exploits their speech to persuade the audience.

-Rule8:

-The current rule is violated when Trump occupies the sufficient conditions as necessary ones by asserting *"..People have been their lives have been destroyed for doing one-fifth of what you've done."* People's lives may be destroyed because of reasons other than the action that Clinton does such as car accidents, heart attack...etc.

-To violate this rule, Clinton also positioning sufficient conditions in the place of the necessary ones when she says *"There are children suffering in this catastrophic war, largely, I believe, because of Russian aggression. And we need to do our part."* Those children in Syria may suffer from things or sides other than Russian may be because of ISIS, the blockade , Assad regime...etc

-This rule can be violated again by committing the fallacy of composition when Clinton asked the citizen *"Are you a teacher..."* supposing that all the teachers has the same question and concerns.

-Rule 10:

-This rule is violated when Clinton performs the fallacy of unclarity via employing the method of vagueness when she presents her vague argument *"there's been a lot of very divisive, dark things said about Muslims"* . This will lead to vague understanding since it is unclear to the audience what are those dark thinks? and to what extent they are dark? By doing so, Clinton tends to exploit Muslims in order to be in her side against Trump and as a result ,they will vote for her.

-The fallacy of unclarity that Trump commits represented via employing the implicitness, when he presents sentence like *" Just today, policemen was shot, two killed. And this is happening on a weekly basis"* it is

unclear what is his intention behind it since it can handle more than one interpretation. Is he informs the audience or warning them or what?

-Another violation within rule10 can be achieved by introducing illogical order as in Trump's arguments *" Yes, I'm very embarrassed by it. I hate it. But it's locker room talk, and it's one of those things. I will knock the hell out of ISIS...."*.His jumping from one topics to another in such illogical manner is unacceptable and it will confuse the audience and pull them to standpoint other than that one under discussion.

4.2 Results

This part introduces the results arrived at via applying the percentage equation of fallacies in the debate under discussion. Then tables will be utilized to display the results. The statistical results have been carried out via multiplying the occurrence of each fallacy by 100, then dividing it by the total number of the matter as follows:

Percentage= occurrence of each strategy ×100

Total number of fallacies

What must be mentioned here is that rule 9 with committing fallacies will not be included in the statistical table since the violation of this rule cannot be counted in numbers because all the debate is about violating it. It can be described as the general feature of the presidential debate.

Table.1: Statistics of Fallacies in the Debate.

No.	Fallacies	Frequency	Percentage%
1	Rule 1	15	(13%)
2	Rule 2	14	(12%)
3	Rule 3	7	(6%)
4	Rule 4	30	(25%)
5	Rule 5	7	(6%)
6	Rule 6	10	(8%)
7	Rule 7	11	(9%)
8	Rule 8	8	(7%)
9	Rule 9	-----	-----
10	Rule 10	17	(14%)
	Total	119	(100%)

The arguers in the debate violated rule4more than any other rule. This violation represented by(30)instances that equal to the percentage of (25) of the whole debate. Rule 1,2 and 10 occupy the second rate or rules frequency, each one has been violated (15),(14) and (17)times orderly which constitute (13%),(12%) and (14%) of the debate. Rule 3and 5 share the same number of violations made via the arguers that are represented by the number (7) which constitute (6%) of the whole data. The rest of rules,

namely (6), (7) and (8) range from (10), (11) and (8) that representing the percentages (8%), (9%) and (7%) of the debate.

V. CONCLUSIONS

1. Fallacies can be triggered easily in presidential debates due to their persuasive nature. They are significant features of political texts. The overall aim of the disputants in political debates is winning the debate and all things the debaters do are running away from things lead them to bad situations, and do their best to attack each other in direct and indirect ways.
2. Violating rule 4 is just like a habit for the debaters. It occupies the highest number of usage among all other fallacies representing via (30) instances. This finding verifies the hypothesis of the study (Violate rule 4 is the most prominent fallacy committed in the debate under investigation). The reason behind this dominance is that rhetorical devices provide to the debater a wider space from which he owns many choices of persuasion. When the arguer violates rule 4 he may put his opponent under pressure via threatening him, attack his characteristics, play on the audience's emotions and many other ploys. Therefore, violate rule 4 can be seen as the most manipulated devices that the arguer exploits to turn the ball to his own playground.
3. Rule (9) has a special treatment since it can be described as the general characteristic of the debate. All the debate is about violating it due to the fact that there is no agreement between the disputants on any specific point. The dispute mostly seems to be audience oriented besides that the debater's standpoints remain the same before and after the discussion. Each debater intends to be acknowledged as the winner as each one begins and ends the debate with the sensation that he is the only right person.
4. Fallacies can be widely used in every day argumentations. Humans may employ them either consciously or unconsciously even in the simplest form of their conversations.
5. It is preferred to describe presidential debate as a chess game through which the arguers exploit all their attacked ways to win the game. Yet, the end of the debate is unknown in the immediate moments since there is no clear winner. This means that it is a matter of audiences judgment whether the debaters were convinced or not and this can be discovered in the results of the elections.

REFERENCES

- [1] Arroyo, B. and Jose, L. (2003). "Perdóneme que se lo diga pero vuelve usted a faltar a la verdad, señor González": Form and function of politic verbal behaviour in face-to-face Spanish political debates. *Discourse and Society*. 14(4). 395- 423.
- [2] Bahm, K. et. al. (2004). *Argument and Audience: Presenting Debates in Public Settings*. New York: The International Debate Education Association
- [3] Creswell, J. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*". Pearson Education. Inc.
- [4] Eemeren, F. (2010). *Strategic Maneuvering in Argumentative Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- [5] Eemeren, F. and Grootendorst, R. (1992). *Argumentation, Communication, and Fallacies: A Pragma-Dialectical Perspective*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- [6] Eemeren, F. and Grootendorst, R. (2004). *A Systematic Theory of Argumentation: The pragma-dialectical approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [7] Eemeren, F. et al. (2002). "Argumentation, Analysis, Evaluation, Presentation. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- [8] Eemeren, F. et al. (2009). *Fallacies and Judgments of reasonableness: Empirical Research Concerning the Pragma-Dialectical Discussion Rules*. Springer Science and Business Media B.V.
- [9] Kaid, L. and Bacha, C. (2008). *Encyclopedia of Political Communication*. California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- [10] Freely, A. and Steinberg, D. (2009). *Argumentation and Debate: Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making*. Boston: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- [11] Vion, R. (1992). *La communication Verbale: Analyse des interactions*. Paris: Hachette Supérieur.
- [12] Walton, D. (1995). *A Pragmatic Theory of Fallacy Studies in Rhetoric and Communication*. Alabama: University of Alabama Press.